

C-8,100 ✓ ③

**IN THE HIGH COURT JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR**

**WRIT PETITION No. 5112/2005**

**Petitioner**

S.S. Bhadoriya, aged about 50 years, S/o Shri Kripal Singh Bhadoria, R/o Quarter No. 1/B-40, Kirandul, district South Bastar, Dantewada (Chhattisgarh)

P.R. No. 5225/05  
Presented by Yogesh Pandey  
dated 31/10/05

**Respondents**

**VERSUS**

- ✓ 1. National Mineral Development Corporation Limited, Head Office, Hyderabad Mazab (Masab) Tank, Castle Hill, Hyderabad (Andhrapradesh).
- ✓ 2. The General Manager, N.M.D.C. BAILADILA iron Ore Project, Deposit No. 14, Kirandul district South Bastar, Dantewada (Chhattisgarh).
- ✓ 3. Director (Prd.), National Mineral D.C. Ltd. Massab Tank Hyderabad, (Appellate Authority)



**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE**  
**CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**

(134)

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (CHHATTISGARH)**

**Writ Petition No.5412 of 2005**

S.S. Bhadoriya

-Versus-

National Mineral Development Corporation Ltd. & others

Present:

Shri Yogesh Pandey, Advocate:

For petitioner.

Shri Vinod Deshmukh, Advocate:

For respondents.

**ORAL ORDER**

(Passed on 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2006)

**SATISH AGNIHOTRI, J.**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has preferred the statutory appeal before respondent No.3 which was pending consideration at the time when this petition was filed praying that the original impugned order dated 12.12.2004 be quashed. The petitioner has come earlier by way of Writ Petition No.114/2005 impugning the order dated 12.12.2004 which was disposed of with liberty to file an appeal before the appropriate authority prescribed under the law.
2. The petitioner, in this petition, has not prayed for early disposal of the appeal, but reiterated the same prayer, which was made in Writ Petition No.114/2005, the same stood disposed of with liberty to file statutory appeal. However, the petitioner has made specific averment in the petition that the appeal was pending consideration at the time of filing of this petition. It is now, informed by learned counsel for the petitioner that the appeal has now been disposed of by respondent No.3.
3. In view of the subsequent development, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file fresh petition impugning the order, if any, passed in the statutory appeal filed by the petitioner impugning the order dated 12.12.2004 (Annexure-P/1). No order as to costs.
4. Certified copy as per Rules.

Sd/-  
**Satish K. Agnihotri**  
Judge